

I am much interested in the application and wish to lend my support for the conservation of *Thamnophis sirtalis infernalis* (Blainville, 1835) and *T. s. tetrataenia* (Cope in Yarrow, 1875). The case involves the stability of usage of these names, and frequency of usage is the determining factor especially in the non-taxonomic literature (inasmuch as taxonomists are the guardians of nomenclatural communication through all aspects of biology, not just among taxonomists). The usage of *T. s. tetrataenia* for the San Francisco garter snake in non-taxonomic as well as taxonomic literature in the past several decades is so extensive that replacement by the name *infernalis* would clearly be pervasively confusing throughout the broad spectrum of usage the name enjoys (paras. 5 and 6 of the application). A switch of the meaning of the name *infernalis*, currently used for the more widely distributed California red-sided garter snake, would serve no useful purpose other than rectification of a long-standing, unwitting and until now unknown error of identification. That error would be rectified by the proposed action of the present application, without disturbing established nomenclatural custom. I therefore strongly recommend approval of the proposals.

Comments on the proposed conservation of usage of 15 mammal specific names based on wild species which are antedated by or contemporary with those based on domestic animals

(Case 3010; see BZN 53: 28-37, 125, 192-200, 286-288; 54: 119-129, 189; 55: 43-46, 119-120)

(1) Nagy Szabolcs

*University of Agriculture, Institute of Animal Breeding,
H-9200 Mosonmagyaróvár, Vár u. 4, Hungary*

I have read the application and comments with great interest.

As part of my job I give lectures to students on animal breeding, including domestication, and I am sure that the proposals for the use of names contained in the application will be very useful to me. I have found much confusion in the Hungarian literature, as elsewhere, in the use of Latin names for domestic animals and their ancestors. I will henceforth be following the use of names set out in the application.

(2) Alvaro Mones

*Museo Nacional de Historia Natural, Casilla de Correo 399, 11000 Montevideo,
Uruguay*

I completely agree with the proposals in this application.

The only point on which I am a little doubtful is in the case of the guinea pig, *Cavia aperea* Erxleben, 1777. The systematics of caviids, and particularly of the genus *Cavia* Pallas, 1766, is in great need of revision. The name *C. aperea* is being applied to wild representatives with a very wide distribution, from northeastern Brazil to Uruguay and Argentina, although it is possible that different populations are not conspecific. As far as I know, it has not been demonstrated that *C. aperea* is the ancestor of the domestic form, *C. porcellus* (Linnaeus, 1758). The type locality of both forms is said

to be Pernambuco, Brazil, but it is well known that this does not have the same meaning as in the second half of the 18th century since it then referred to a much larger area than the Brazilian state known today (that is, it included at least the states Paraíba, Pernambuco, Alagoas and Sergipe). It is very uncertain that the domestic form comes from this region and I do not know of any Indian tribe there that had or has domesticated guinea pigs. At the moment I am not sure that we have the necessary information to resolve the problem of the origin of the domestic guinea pig. On the other hand, I think that the usage of the names *C. aperea* and *C. porcellus* for the wild and domestic forms of the guinea pig, as proposed in the application, is the best solution in our present understanding.

Comment on the proposed conservation of LORISIDAE Gray, 1821 and GALAGIDAE Gray, 1825 (Mammalia, Primates) as the correct original spellings
(Case 3004; see BZN 55: 165–168)

D.W. Yalden

*School of Biological Sciences, University of Manchester, 3.239 Stopford Building,
Oxford Road, Manchester M13 9PT, U.K.*

I write as Managing Editor of *Mammal Review*.

I should like to express my support for this application. Although the correct derivation according to the Code of the family-group names LORISIDAE Gray, 1821 and GALAGIDAE Gray, 1825 (para. 3 of the application) has not been followed, the names as presented are indeed very familiar and well used throughout the zoological world. I note that deviations from grammatical correctness are frequently used to derive variant family names that would otherwise be homonyms. Reverting to the 'grammatically correct' names here would serve no useful purpose.